

00000460002
X Sig B US
X Sic 6 Cuba
X Gg 2
X Gg 6 1
X F 2 B. HARRIS

Dear Mr. Dryden:

Mr. Kyle condemns both the pacifatory theory of the Race for Peace Council and the war-like push of the right wingers.

In my humble opinion, the U. S. has pursued both policies, and I quote Mr. Kyle, "at every sacrifice," for the past twenty years.

Let's review the record and the sacrifices:

The Roosevelt Administration's complacency until our shameful humiliation at Pearl Harbor (an event for which we could and should have been prepared); Roosevelt's blundering concessions at Yalta (against the strong objections of the venerable Winston Churchill, a man with more wisdom and insight than Roosevelt could ever have hoped to attain), giving Russia half of Europe; Harry Truman's plunge into the Korean war, again unprepared, at the cost of many lives; his second thought misgivings when he yanked General McArthur for his "overaggressiveness," thereby compounding his original stupidity; the baiting of Eisenhower into a position where he was internationally humiliated by Khrushchev (abortive Summit Conference in France); the erection of the Berlin wall without anything more than strong diplomatic objections from the Kennedy administration; the harassment of allied planes in the Berlin air corridor, again met by JFK with puny diplomatic objections; the abortive Cuban invasion fiasco, planned by the U. S. Central Intelligence Agency (a group of elderly schoolboys playing spy games with the innocent lives against skillful and hardened communists.)

Small wonder that Berlin and the whole of Western Europe are leary of our intentions and actually wonder whether they can count on our support in the event of a Russian attack. With this foreign policy record, we might conceivably call a cease fire, run onto the battlefield, shake hands with the Russians and then drop bombs on our allies.

Recalling the past twenty years, I desperately hope that Mr. Kyles' statement, "I agree with this two-level policy" means only that he agrees with the theory of it, and not the inexcusable and blundering methods of its expedition, thus far.

As for the Peace for Peace Council, I suggest they review the publications from the above and their consequences.

For those who at this point are branding me a war-monger, let me make this clear:—I agree with the theory of the two-level policy. I am all for pacifism at the proper time and for a firm stand, yes, even aggressiveness, when it will forward the defense of democracy. But it seems that unless we can locate some administrators with insight, timing and judgment, the two level policy is doing more harm than good.

Again, for the Race for Peace Council, I am not a pessimist; Jesus Christ (in the book of St. Matthew, Chap. 24: V.6 and in the book of St. Mark, Chap. 13: V.7) says: "And ye shall hear of wars and rumors of wars: see that ye be not troubled: for all these things must come to pass: but the end is not yet." And who are we mortals to question or attempt to alter His divine prophesies?

I must state emphatically that I believe a war with communism is inevitable. How far in the future that war is, no one can say. A firm stand at this time will serve the purpose of immobilizing Russia's policy of grabbing the world, piece by piece, until we have no allies remaining. A pacifist policy, on the other hand, will aid her expedition of this policy, as it has for the past twenty years.

It would seem to me that we have overemployed pacifism for quite some time now. Let me here quote a Confederate General, who said, "get there fustest with the mostest." To me, at this time, this means a firm, if not aggressive stand with Russia, consisting of not giving an inch when the next crisis arises.

Let me remind the reader that Russia will not fight until the following two things have taken place: (a) They have gained every inch possible without an outright war, and (b) their military superiority is overwhelmingly greater than ours. An unwavering stand will cause the first to take place, but the second will never occur unless we allow it.

Once we have shown our adamant side, we may be able to employ pacifism with some effect in later crises. At the present, pacifism on our part has become obsolete because of our lack of aggressiveness. Until we restore confidence in the Western

...that we can, if necessary, do
...is utterly worthless
...fully aware that the President
Kennedy cannot correct the errors of
the first two, three admiral's railroa
...think that he should turn a
... (equivalent to about a 1 of the
...the zealotness of Estes Ke
... and Robert Kennedy) toward
... with Russia to prevent fut
... social ices to communism.
... the way, and the only way,
... to have enough remain
... to "get there first with
... money" when the big war does
... arrive.

My heartfelt thanks to both Mr. K. and the Board for Peace Council for providing the nucleus of a motion picture to cause me to write this. It has unburdened me considerably.

Sincerely yours,
B. M. Harris